UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/48/546
S/26636
26 October 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-eighth session
Agenda item 54
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-eighth year

Letter dated 26 October 1993 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Osman Ertuğ, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 54, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) İnal BATU
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

ANNEX

Letter dated 26 October 1993 from Mr. Osman Ertuğ
to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to a letter addressed to you by the Greek Cypriot representative on 24 September 1993, which was circulated under the symbol A/48/458-S/26506 on 30 September 1993.

This letter concerns the demographic structure of Cyprus, a subject which the Greek Cypriot administration has been persistently exploiting, notwithstanding the fact that it is the Greek Cypriot side itself which, in collaboration with Greece, has long been trying to alter the demographic structure of the island in favour of the Greek side.

As part of their campaign to do so, a total of 10,350 mainland Greeks had been settled in the island as early as the Second World War, as documented by the records of the then British Colonial Office (document No. C.O.67.328).

Following the Greek Cypriot onslaught on the Turkish Cypriot community in 1963, as many as 20,000 mainland Greek troops were brought to the island clandestinely, in order to materialize the annexation of the island to Greece (ENOSIS). This has been admitted by high Greek officials.

Ample evidence also exists in the reports of the United Nations Secretaries-General to the Security Council (for example, reports S/5950 of 10 September 1964 and S/8286 of 8 December 1967) pertaining to the illegal importation of Greek mainland troops and their being given "legal status" in order to resettle them in the island on a permanent basis.

While this was being done, a parallel process of evicting the Turkish Cypriots from their ancestral homeland was put into effect, resulting in the forced emigration of thousands of Turkish Cypriots to other countries. Furthermore, Turkish Cypriots born after 1960 were not registered, in order to lower the growth rate of the Turkish Cypriot population.

In the conditions of security and opportunity established after 1974 in Northern Cyprus, many Turkish Cypriots, who were forced by the Greek Cypriot administration to emigrate, have opted to return to their homeland. As a result of the demand created by a newly reactivated, growing economy, a number of workers also came from other countries, mostly from Turkey because of its proximity and cultural affinity. A number of these people who fulfilled the requirements of citizenship either by marriage or five years of residence, or by virtue of having been born on the island, have been granted citizenship. Their number, however, is nowhere near what the Greek Cypriot administration claims, since our economy would not be able to withstand such an influx in such a short time. Greek Cypriot allegations in this regard, therefore, defy even the basic norms of logic.

It will be appreciated that this practice, in any event, falls totally within the sovereignty, competence and jurisdiction of the government authorities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The Greek Cypriot

administration authorities clearly have no say or jurisdiction over this matter. It should also be noted that the Greek Cypriot administration, whose competence and jurisdiction extend only over Southern Cyprus, has, in recent years, allowed the resettlement and employment of thousands of non-Greek immigrants in Southern Cyprus, in addition to the settlers from mainland Greece.

It is, therefore, obvious that the Greek Cypriot side's allegations in this respect are nothing but a propaganda ploy designed to mislead the international community and to create new obstacles in the way of reconciliation in Cyprus. Ultimately, they stand out as yet another proof that the Greek Cypriots lack the interest and political will to settle the Cyprus issue and are rather bent on perpetuating it in order to use it as a political weapon against us.

I shall be grateful if the text of the present letter is circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 54, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Osman ERTUĞ
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/48/547
27 October 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Forty-eighth session
Agenda items 54, 107 and 108

QUESTION OF CYPRUS

ELIMINATION OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

RIGHTS OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION

Letter dated 25 October 1993 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Osman Ertuğ, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 54, 107 and 108.

(Signed) Inal BATU
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

ANNEX

Letter dated 25 October 1993 from Mr. Osman Ertuğ to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot delegate at the meeting of the Third Committee on 15 October 1993 during the discussion of agenda items 107 and 108, entitled "Elimination of racism and racial discrimination" and "Right of peoples to self-determination", respectively.

Since, due to the forceful usurpation and continued monopolization of the title of "the Government of Cyprus" by the Greek Cypriot administration, the Turkish Cypriot side is unable to exercise its natural right of reply at the Third Committee, I am compelled to respond to the Greek Cypriot delegate's inflammatory remarks in writing.

I wish to point out at the outset that the groundless allegations and hypocritical arguments advanced by the Greek Cypriot delegate at the said meeting are a tiresome repetition of those he made last year. Since I had sufficiently responded to them with a letter dated 20 October 1993 (see document A/47/567-S/24695 dated 22 October 1992), I do not wish to go into them again in detail. I would, however, like to reiterate our response to some of the more glaring examples of distortion and misrepresentation in the aforesaid statement of the Greek Cypriot delegate, in order to put the facts on record:

1. If there is a party which has practised not only racism, racial discrimination and multiple violations of human rights, but also the repulsive method of ethnic cleansing, it is the Greek Cypriot side itself. The massacres, crimes and atrocities committed by the Greek Cypriots against the Turkish Cypriot people between 1963 and 1974 are such well-established and well-documented facts that they hardly need to be elaborated here.

2. The Greek Cypriot delegate's portrayal of the Turkish Cypriot people as an "ethnic community manipulated by external interference" adds insult to injury. Recent history clearly shows who manipulated, and continues to manipulate, which community in Cyprus for its own irredentist aims.

The campaign of violence and warfare waged by the Greek invading army, in collaboration with the local Greek Cypriot armed elements, against the Turkish Cypriot population, the human suffering and destruction it had brought to the island, culminating in the coup d'etat of July 1974 and the ultimate division of the island, are well known and need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say, one would have hoped that the Greek Cypriot leadership has learned a lesson from the unfortunate chain of events which it had unleashed itself. It is regrettable, however, that the present Greek Cypriot leader, Mr. Glafcos Clerides, in total disregard of his side's past mistakes, has made it a policy priority for his administration to have an additional Greek military division brought to the island, rekindling fears that the Greek Cypriot leadership is trying to set the stage for new adventures.

It is indeed ironic that, at a time when his own leader is actively seeking further interference and inviting manipulation by Greece in Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot delegate at the Third Committee should have the audacity to complain about alleged "external interference and manipulation" of the Turkish Cypriots by Turkey. Far from being manipulative or interventionist, the peace-keeping role that Turkey has successfully played in Cyprus in the last 19 years continues to serve as the only effective deterrent against the repetition of Greek aggression and manipulation in the island.

3. The Greek Cypriot delegate's allegations that "Cyprus is a victim of foreign invasion and occupation" and that "its people are not allowed to freely express their aspirations" are equally ludicrous and totally misdirected. The dramatic remarks made by Archbishop Makarios before the Security Council on 19 July 1974, in the wake of the Greek coup d'etat, are precise as to who was invading Cyprus when Turkey stepped in to save the island from being colonized by Greece and the Turkish Cypriots from being annihilated: a/

> "No revolution took place in Cyprus which could be considered as an internal matter. It was an invasion which violated the independence and the sovereignty of tne Republic ... It is clearly an invasion from outside ... The coup of the Greek Junta is an invasion, and from its consequences the whole people of Cyprus suffers, both Greeks and Turks."

If there is an occupation in Cyprus today, it is the continued occupation of the seat of Government by the Greek Cypriot usurpers of power. Indeed, it was the Greek Cypriot usurpers of power. Indeed, it was the Greek Cypriot side who seceded from the legitimate bi-communal partnership State in 1963 by forcibly expelling the Turkish Cypriots from all organs of the State and turning the partnership Republic into a purely Greek Cypriot enterprise, which it is today.

4. Separate right to self-determination for each component people or community in Cyprus has long existed and continues to exist. It was first exercised by each community in forming the bi-national Republic of 1960. This inherent right of the Turkish Cypriot people was again manifested when the Greek Cypriots, by force of arms, destroyed the partnership Republic, expelling the Turkish Cypriots from the State organs and monopolizing the government apparatus. The unlawful state of affairs created by the Greek Cypriot usurpation of governmental authority had left the Turkish Cypriot people with no choice but to exercise their right to self-determination separately, as the alternative would have been to subject themselves to Greek Cypriot domination and oppression, and ultimate elimination. Thus, they organized themselves in areas under their control and administered their day-to-day affairs, refusing to be subjugated by the Greek Cypriot side.

5. That the Turkish Cypriots have since exercised this right separately and continue to do so is a matter of fact, not legal fiction. By refusing to acknowledge this reality, the Greek Cypriot side is not helping the process of

---

a/ S/PV.1780, paras. 18, 23 and 32.

negotiations aimed at a viable and just solution, because it is the two equal communities or peoples who, through the exercise of the right to self-determination, can bring about such a solution based on their free will to be expressed through separate referenda. To argue the opposite is to shut the door to a mutually acceptable, negotiated settlement and constitutes a veiled attempt to bring the Turkish Cypriots under Greek Cypriot hegemony.

6. The Greek Cypriot argument that the Turkish Cypriots do not have the separate right to self-determination because they are not "a nation with the characteristics of a people" is thus historically and factually incorrect. This claim is based on the assumption that there is a "Cypriot nation" and that the Turkish Cypriots are a "minority" within this "nation", whereas the Greek Cypriots were the first to refute the existence of a "Cypriot nation". As early as March 1963, Archbishop Makarios had declared that "the Cyprus Agreements of 1960 established a State but not a nation". The same Agreements, in recognition of the sui generis situation prevailing in Cyprus, where two ethnically, culturally and linguistically distinct communities exist, had conferred upon each community the status of a "people" and recognized their "co-founder partner" status in a bi-national Republic.

7. The Turkish Cypriots never abused the right to self-determination which, as explained above, was inherent in the Agreements. On the contrary, it was the Greek Cypriots who repeatedly abused this principle by trying to convert the bi-national Republic into a Greek Cypriot one, and by attempting to unite the island with Greece (ENOSIS). They continue to abuse that principle by claiming to be the sole representatives for the whole of Cyprus, whereas they know full well that they do not have the consent of the Turkish Cypriot people to do so. The lack of any such consent, which is essential for a legitimate, representative government, puts the Greek Cypriot administration and its representatives in the position of impostor.

In the final analysis, the Greek Cypriot side's phobia concerning the application of the right to self-determination, which is prevalent in virtually every paragraph of the Greek Cypriot delegate's statement, is yet another evidence of his side's archaic mentality that Cyprus is a Greek land and that the Turkish Cypriots are, at best, a "minority". This is a clear rejection of the concept of a negotiated solution to the Cyprus question based on equality, and I am sure Your Excellency, as well as the international community, will duly take into account the negative implications of this approach for your efforts to establish trust and confidence in the island and for the achievement of an overall solution.

I shall be grateful if this letter is circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 54, 107 and 108.

(Signed) Osman ERTUĞ
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/48/548
26 October 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Forty-eighth session
Agenda item 14

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Letter dated 25 October 1993 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon the instructions from my Government, I present my compliments to you and have the honour to clarify the position of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with regard to the unjust action of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

The IAEA did not do what it had to do in response to the sincere efforts of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to solve the "nuclear issue" through negotiations, but, instead, adopted an unreasonable "resolution" at its last General Conference. The IAEA is at present making another attempt to include the "nuclear issue" in the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations. This is nothing but a trick to cover its scope of partiality committed by itself under the guise of the name of international community.

The "nuclear issue" on the Korean peninsula is a question to be solved between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States of America. If the ongoing Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States of America talks proceed well, all the issues concerned will be resolved smoothly. It is entirely unreasonable, at the time when the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States of America talks are going on, to include the "nuclear issue" in the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly rather than to wait and see the results of the talks.

The United Nations has not liquidated its abnormal past with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Under these circumstances, if it adopts the "resolution", it will only leave another stain in its history. If the United Nations is truly interested in the just solution of the Korean issue, it will draw its due attention to the replacement of the armistice agreement with a peace agreement, which is the most pressing issue in the Korean peninsula.

I would be grateful if you could make arrangements to have this letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 14.

(Signed) PAK Gil Yon
Ambassador and
Permanent Representative